



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/524,649

04/11/2005

Ekkhard Beer

05587-00375-US

8462

23416

7590

04/29/2008

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ, LLP

P O BOX 2207

WILMINGTON, DE 19899

EXAMINER

NELSON, MICHAEL B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

4145

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/29/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/524,649

**Applicant(s)**

BEER ET AL.

**Examiner**

MICHAEL B. NELSON

**Art Unit**

4145

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11, 12, 15-17 and 22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 18-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-855)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 02/17/05.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-10, and 18-21, drawn to a multilayer polyolefin film.

Group II, claim(s) 11, 12, 17, drawn to a process for producing a multilayer polyolefin film.

Group III, claim(s) 15 and 22, drawn to pharmaceutical blister packs.

Group IV, claim(s) 16, drawn to a laminated article.

2. The inventions listed as Groups I-IV do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: the special technical feature, which is the multilayer polyolefin film composed of at least three layers, comprising I)

a) a core layer A functioning as base layer and composed of at least one amorphous polyolefin

b) on the two sides, outer layers B and C composed of a mixture composed of polypropylene and of at least one amorphous polyolefin,

or II) a) a core layer A composed of a mixture of at least one semicrystalline polyolefin and 5.0% by weight or more of at least one amorphous polyolefin, and

b) two outer layers B and C which are identical or different, composed of a semicrystalline polyolefin and/or of a mixture composed of polypropylene and of at least one amorphous

polyolefin, though shared between all inventions, does not define a contribution which each of the claimed inventions considered as a whole, makes over the prior art. Kochem et al. (U.S. 6,017,616) discloses a thermoformable film with a core layer of one amorphous polyolefin (COC) (See Abstract) and two outer layers of polypropylene and amorphous polyolefin (C5, L35-50).

2. During a telephone conversation with Dick Beck on 03/28/08 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-10 and 18-21. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 11, 12, 15-17 and 22 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

3. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

***Specification***

4. The use of the trademarks has been noted in this application. They should be capitalized wherever they appear and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1-10 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 1-10 and 18-21, the phrase "on the two sides" is recited in claim 1b, line 3. This phrase is vague and indefinite in that it is unclear which two sides (i.e. the two sides of what?) are being referred to. For the purposes of advancing prosecution, the phrase in question will be taken as referring to the two opposite planar sides of the core layer A.

Regarding claim 4, the listing of formulas I-VI (i.e. without the limitation "or") renders the claim vague and indefinite since it is unclear if all or only one or more of equations I-VI are part of the limitations for the amorphous polyolefin derivative. For the purposes of advancing prosecution, the limitations will be taken as meaning that only one, but possibly more, of the

Art Unit: 1794

equations I-VI need to be the cyclic or polycyclic olefin from which the amorphous polyolefin is derived. It would be remedial to put the phrase "or" in between formulas V and VI.

Regarding claims 7 and 18, the phrase "the proportion of amorphous polyolefin in a mixture composed of at least one semicrystalline polyolefin" is vague and indefinite in that it is unclear which mixture is being referred to. Both mixtures I and II in instant claim 1, have an amorphous polyolefins and semicrystalline polyolefins (polypropylene is the semicrystalline polyolefin in mixture I). For the purposes of advancing prosecution the phrase in question will be taken as referring to the proportion of amorphous polyolefin to semicrystalline polyolefin in mixture II of instant claim 1.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1-10, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Honma (U.S. 5,300,352).

Regarding claim 1, Honma discloses a multilayer polyolefin film composed of at least three layers, comprising

- I) a) a core layer A functioning as base layer and composed of at least one amorphous polyolefin and b) on the two sides, outer layers B and C composed of a mixture composed of polypropylene and of at least one amorphous polyolefin,
- or II) a) a core layer A composed of a mixture of at least one semicrystalline polyolefin and 5.0% by weight or more of at least one amorphous polyolefin, and b) two outer layers B and C which are identical or different, composed of a semicrystalline polyolefin and/or of a mixture composed of polypropylene and of at least one amorphous polyolefin.

(See C25, L40-50 and Fig. 2. The laminate structure is for one substrate (core) layer and two resin surface layers on both sides of the substrate. See C1, L65-C2, L41, the core layer is either at least one cycloolefin polymer (i.e. amorphous polyolefin) [A] or a cycloolefin polymer composition [B], which comprises cycloolefin polymer [A] and a crystalline polyolefin. The disclosed percent of amorphous polyolefin to crystalline polyolefin is between 10 and 95% wt, which significantly overlaps the claimed range with both endpoint lying within the claimed range (C23, L27-47). The disclosed core composition [A] reads on the core layer of instant laminate I, and the disclosed core composition [B] reads on the core layer of instant laminate II. The outer resin layers are disclosed as being made of the same types of resins which are disclosed for the core layer ([A] and [B]). Propylene is one of the crystalline polyolefins to be mixed with cycloolefin [A] to produce composition [B], which, as a disclosed outer layer composition, would read on the outer layers of instant laminates I and II (C20, L35-57).)

Regarding claims 2-6, Honma discloses all of the claimed limitations as set forth above.

Additionally, the reference discloses a multilayer polyolefin film

- wherein the amorphous polyolefin is a cycloolefin copolymer and/or a cycloolefinic polymer.
- wherein the amorphous polyolefin is a copolymer composed of ethylene and/or of an alpha-olefin and of a cyclic, bicyclic, or polycyclic olefin.
- wherein the amorphous polyolefin derives from at least one cyclic or polycyclic olefin of the following formulae **I to VI**, where R1, R2, R3, R4, R5, R6, R7, and Rs are identical or different and are a hydrogen atom or a C1-C20-hydrocarbon radical, such as a linear or branched C1-C8-alkyl radical, C6-C18-aryl radical, or C7-C20-alkylenearyl radical, or a cyclic or acyclic C2-C20-alkenyl radical, or form a saturated, unsaturated, or aromatic ring, where identical radicals R1 to R8 have a different meaning in the various formulae I to VI, and where n assumes values from 0 to 5, and from 0 to 99.9% by weight, preferably from 0.1 to 99.9% by weight, based on the total weight of the cycloolefin copolymer, of polymerized units which derive from one or more acyclic olefins of the formula **VII** where R9, R10, R11, and R12 are identical or different and are a hydrogen atom, a linear, branched, saturated or unsaturated C1-C20-hydrocarbon radical, such as a C1-C8-alkyl radical or a C6-C18-aryl radical.
- wherein the amorphous polyolefin is a cycloolefin copolymer which contains, based on its total weight, from 0 to 45% by weight of polymerized units which derive from one or more monocyclic olefins of the formula **VIII** where m is a number from 2 to 10.
- wherein the amorphous polyolefin is a copolymer composed of ethylene and norbornene.



(See C3, L27-C15, L27. Cycloolefin copolymers are disclosed as being copolymers of cyclic, bicyclic, or polycyclic olefins, (C4-C14), which read on some of the polycyclic olefins of instant Formulae I-VI and ethylene, which reads on instant formula VIII. See C16, L40-55, the amount of ethylene in the copolymer is disclosed as being between 52 and 90 %, which significantly overlaps the instant claimed range with both endpoints lying within the instant claimed range. Since there is no disclosure in Honma with regards to a monocyclic olefin of the instant formula VIII, the implicit 0% in the composition reads on the disclosed range. Also, norbornene is disclosed as part of the copolymerization with ethylene (C14, L60-C15, L27).)

Regarding claim 7, Honma discloses all of the claimed limitations as set forth above. Additionally, the reference discloses a multilayer polyolefin film wherein the proportion of amorphous polyolefin in a mixture composed of at least one semicrystalline polyolefin and of at least one amorphous polyolefin is from 10 to 50% by weight.

(See, C23, L27-47. The disclosed percent of amorphous polyolefin to crystalline polyolefin is between 10 and 95% wt, preferably between 20 and 80%, which completely overlaps the claimed range with both lower endpoints, (10 and 20%) lying within the claimed range.)

Regarding claim 8, Honma discloses all of the claimed limitations as set forth above. Additionally, the reference discloses a multilayer polyolefin film

- wherein the amorphous polyolefin has a glass transition temperature  $T_g$  in the range from 60 to 300°C, the softening point in the range from 70 to 200°C,

(See C20, L18-30, the softening point of the cycloolefin polymer is disclosed as being preferably between 90 and 250°C, which significantly overlaps the claimed range with the lower endpoint lying within the claimed range. Also the glass transition temperature is disclosed as being between 50 and 230°C, which significantly overlaps the claimed range, with the upper endpoint lying within the claimed range.)

Honma does not explicitly disclose the specific amorphous polyolefin has an average molecular weight  $M_w$  in the range from 1000 to 500 000 of the multilayer film. However, in light of the substantially identical glass transition temperature and softening point in the amorphous polyolefin of Honma with the instant amorphous polyolefin, it will, inherently, possess the claimed properties, absent any objective evidence to the contrary. See MPEP 2112 (In re Fitzgerald, 619 F.2d 67, 70, 205 USPQ 594, 596 (CCPA 1980)).

Regarding claim 9, Honma discloses all of the claimed limitations as set forth above. Additionally, the reference discloses a multilayer polyolefin film wherein the thickness of the film is from 50 to 300 micrometers and the thicknesses of the outer layers make up from 2.5 to 90% of the entire structure.

(See, C24, L25-35, the thickness of the substrate is disclosed as being between 0.1 and 10 mm (i.e. 100-10000 micrometers). See C26, L5-15, the thickness of the resin surface layers is disclosed as being between 50 and 500 micrometers. In the embodiment

of Fig.2, the total thickness of the film ranges from 200 to 11000 micrometers (i.e.  $100+50*2$  and  $10000+500*2$ ). This range significantly overlaps the claimed range with the lower endpoint (200 micrometers) lying within the claimed range. The percent in thickness of the outer layers to the total film thickness ranges from 0.99% to 90.9% (i.e.  $50*2/10100$  and  $500*2/1100$ ), which completely overlaps the claimed range with the upper endpoint of the preferred thicknesses of the outer resin layers (i.e. 300 micrometers,  $300*2/700 = 85.7\%$ ) lying within the claimed range.)

Regarding claim 10, Honma discloses all of the claimed limitations as set forth above. Additionally, the reference discloses a multilayer polyolefin film wherein the semicrystalline polyolefin present comprises a polymer composed of ethylene or of alpha-olefins or comprises copolymers of these.

(See C20, L35-40, ethylene and alpha-olefin copolymers are disclosed as the semicrystalline component.)

Regarding claim 18, Honma discloses all of the claimed limitations as set forth above. Additionally, the reference discloses a multilayer polyolefin film wherein the proportion of amorphous polyolefin in a mixture composed of at least one semicrystalline polyolefin and of at least one amorphous polyolefin is from 15 to 40% by weight.

(See, C23, L27-47. The disclosed percent of amorphous polyolefin to crystalline polyolefin is between 10 and 95% wt, preferably between 20 and 80%, which completely

overlaps the claimed range with the preferred lower endpoints, (20%), lying within the claimed range.)

Regarding claim 20, Honma discloses all of the claimed limitations as set forth above. Additionally, the reference discloses a multilayer polyolefin film wherein the thickness of the film is from 75 to 250 micrometers, and the thicknesses of the outer layers make up from 2.5 to 90% of the entire structure.

(Sec, C24, L25-35, the thickness of the substrate is disclosed as being between 0.1 and 10 mm (i.e. 100-10000 micrometers). See C26, L5-15, the thickness of the resin surface layers is disclosed as being between 50 and 500 micrometers. In the embodiment of Fig.2, the total thickness of the film ranges from 200 to 11000 micrometers (i.e.  $100+50*2$  and  $10000+500*2$ ). This range significantly overlaps the claimed range with the lower endpoint (200 micrometers) lying within the claimed range. The percent in thickness of the outer layers to the total film thickness ranges from 0.99% to 90.9% (i.e.  $50*2/10100$  and  $500*2/1100$ ), which completely overlaps the claimed range with the upper endpoint of the preferred thicknesses of the outer resin layers (i.e. 300 micrometers,  $300*2/700 = 85.7\%$ ) lying within the claimed range.)

Regarding claim 21, Homma discloses all of the claimed limitations as set forth above. Additionally, the reference discloses a multilayer polyolefin film used as a thermoplastic packaging film.

(Sec C27, L25-31, the use of the disclosed film to wrap decorative products makes it a thermoplastic packaging film.)

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

11. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

12. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honma (U.S. 5,300,352), as applied to claims 1 and 7.

Regarding claim 19, Honma discloses all of the claimed limitations as set forth above. Additionally, the reference discloses a multilayer polyolefin film

- wherein the amorphous polyolefin has a glass transition temperature  $T_g$  in the range from 80 to 200°C, the softening point in the range from 80 to 180°C,

(See C20, L18-30, the softening point of the cycloolefin polymer is disclosed as being preferably between 90 and 250°C, which significantly overlaps the claimed range with the lower endpoint lying within the claimed range. Also the glass transition temperature is disclosed as being between 50 and 230°C, which completely overlaps the claimed range.)

Regarding the glass transition temperature, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have selected the overlapping portion of the ranges disclosed by the reference because overlapping ranges have been held to be a prima facie case of obviousness. In re Malagari, 182 USPQ 549.

Honma does not explicitly disclose the specific amorphous polyolefin has an average molecular weight  $M_w$  in the range from 3,000 to 150,000 of the multilayer film. However, in light of the substantially identical glass transition temperature and softening point in the amorphous polyolefin of Honma with the instant amorphous polyolefin, it will, inherently, possess the claimed properties, absent any objective evidence to the contrary. See MPEP 2112 (In re Fitzgerald, 619 F.2d 67, 70, 205 USPQ 594, 596 (CCPA 1980)).

***Double Patenting***

13. Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 9, 19 and 20 of this application conflict with claims 1-3 and 16 of Application No.10/555,619. 37 CFR 1.78(b) provides that when two or more applications filed by the same applicant contain conflicting claims, elimination of such claims from all but one application may be required in the absence of good and sufficient reason for their retention during pendency in more than one application. Applicant is required to either cancel the conflicting claims from all but one application or maintain a clear line of demarcation between the applications. See MPEP § 822.

14. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

15. Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 9, 19 and 20 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 and 16, of copending Application No. 10/555,619. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not

patentably distinct from each other because the core layer of the multilayer packaging film of 10/555,619 is a COC with a similar glass transition temperature and the outer layers, as functional semicrystalline polyolefin layers, reads on the outer layers of the instant application. The ranges for thickness and percent thickness of the outer layers also are prima facie obvious to those having ordinary skill as optimizable result effective variables. Properties such as softening temperature and molecular weight would be inherent in the COC of 10/555,619, given the substantially identical glass transition temperature.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### *Conclusion*

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL B. NELSON whose telephone number is (571)270-3877. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 6AM-4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Basia Ridley can be reached on (571) 272-1453. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Art Unit: 1794

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Gwendolyn Blackwell/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1794

/MN/  
03/24/08